



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,771	01/26/2004	Marcus F. Fontoura	SVL920030116US1	9736

47069 7590 12/14/2006

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/764,771

Applicant(s)

FONTOURA ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____:
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the application filed on 9/29/06.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al. ('Lim' hereinafter), "Dynamic Maintenance of Web Indexes Using Landmarks" in view of Jim McKeeth ('McKeeth' hereinafter), USP, 6,763,362.

With respect to claim 1,

Lim teaches a method for handling redirects in documents (see section 1),
comprising:

forming at least one equivalence class that includes documents that are
connected through a redirect (see section 2.1, Forward Index Update, Lim);

detecting cycles for each equivalence class, wherein documents in a cycle are
marked so that they are not indexed (see section 2.4, Approximate nearness queries,
Lim);

detecting incomplete chains for each equivalence class, wherein documents in
an incomplete chain are marked so that they are not indexed (see section 4,
Experimental Evaluation, Lim); and

selecting a representative for each equivalence class (see section 4, Landmark
Policy and Block Size, Lim) .

Lim does not explicitly indicate claimed documents are to be indexed wherein the
representative is associated with a path that indicates a location of a document in a data
store.

McKeeth teaches claimed documents are to be indexed wherein the
representative is associated with a path that indicates a location of a document in a
data store (the interaction via the network 100 between the search engine server 108
and the content server 104 and the electronic files stores in documents 210. The
search engine server 108 includes a controller 220 in communication with a memory
230, an indexer 204, and a robot 206. The search engine server 108 further comprises

a link database 202 in communication with the indexer 204. The link database 202 are conveniently reside in the memory 230, or it to be located in another memory accessible by the search engine server 108 (see col. 5, lines 32-45, McKeeth).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because documents are to be indexed wherein the representative is associated with a path that indicates a location of a document in a data store of McKeeth's teaching would have allowed Lim's system to optimize the freshness of the links displayed in response to a user query as suggested by McKeeth at col. 6, lines 37-38, McKeeth. Further, the teaching of documents are to be indexed wherein the representative is associated with a path that indicates a location of a document in a data store of McKeeth improves if there are any discrepancies in the data, the indexer stores the appropriate updates in the link database (see col. 6, lines 47-48, McKeeth).

As to claim 2,

Lim teaches wherein the representative is selected based on a type of redirect in an equivalence class (see section 4, Landmark Policy and Block Size, Lim).

As to claim 3,

Lim teaches wherein the representative is selected based on a rank of each document in the equivalence class (see section 2.4, Phrase queries, Lim).

As to claim 4,

Lim teaches locating each document that contains a redirect (see section 1, Lim); and creating an entry in a redirect file for each document (see section 1, Lim).

As to claim 5,

Lim teaches wherein the entry includes a source path, a target path, and a redirect type (see section 2.2, Update Procedure Using Landmarks, Lim).

As to claim 6,

Lim teaches detecting duplicate documents in two different equivalence classes (see section 2.2, Landmarks, Lim); and merging the equivalence classes (see section 1, Lim).

As to claim 7,

Lim teaches wherein documents are duplicates if a certain portion of their content is similar (see section 2.1, Forward Index Update, Lim).

As to claim 8,

Lim teaches wherein the documents in the at least one equivalence class include a target document and one or more source documents and wherein the selected representative is one of the source documents, further comprising: propagating the content of the target document to the selected representative (see section 1, Lim).

As to claim 9,

Lim teaches wherein the documents in the at least one equivalence class include a target document and one or more source documents, and wherein at least one source document includes a path to the target document (see section 2.2, Fig. 4, Lim).

As to claim 10,

Lim teaches indexing the content of the target document with a path of the representative (see Fig. 4, Lim).

As to claim 11,

Lim teaches wherein marking documents so that they are not indexed includes marking documents to indicate the documents are to be ignored (see section 1, Lim).

As to claim 12,

Lim teaches determining a rank for each of the documents, wherein the rank represents an importance of each document relative to the other documents (see section 2.4, Lim).

Claims 13-36 have the same subject matter as of claims 1-12 and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Remarks

5. Reed et al. (USP, 5,862,325) teaches claimed invention including redirecting and equivalence class,.....

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2166

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

MA
June 24, 2006